

### REMARKS

The Official Action dated April 6, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully noted. In view thereof claims 3-6 and 9-18 have been canceled in their entirety without prejudice nor disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Accordingly, claims 7 and 8 are presently pending in the instant application.

Initially, Applicant wishes to acknowledge the Examiner's indication on page 6 of the Office Action that claims 7 and 8 are allowable over the prior art of record. With the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's claimed invention as set forth in claims 7 and 8 as well as the application as a whole is now in proper condition for allowance.

With reference now to page 2 of the Office Action, claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Additionally, claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In this regard, as can be seen from the foregoing amendments, each of claims 9 and 10 have been canceled in their entirety without prejudice nor disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Accordingly, further discussion with respect to the merits of such rejection is no longer believed to be warranted.


Turning now to pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,472,317 issued to Wang et al., claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,168,726 issued to Li et al. and claims 3-6, 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication 10-268526 issued to Sato. In view of the foregoing amendments, claims 3-6, 9 and 10 have been canceled in their

entirety without prejudice nor disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Accordingly, further discussion with respect to the merits of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are no longer believed to be warranted.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 7 and 8 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner believe a conference would be of benefit in expediting the prosecution of the instant application, he is hereby invited to telephone counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Donald R. Studebaker  
Reg. No. 32,815

Nixon Peabody LLP  
401 9<sup>th</sup> Street N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington, D. C. 20004  
(202) 585-8000